



Date: Tuesday, 16 September 2025

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: The Council Chamber, The Guildhall, Frankwell Quay, Shrewsbury, SY3 8HQ

Contact: Emily Marshall, Committee Officer
Tel: 01743 257717
Email: emily.marshall@shropshire.gov.uk

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE

SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS

This page is intentionally left blank

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date:		
<p>NOTE: This schedule reports only additional letters received before 5pm on the day before committee. Any items received on the day of Committee will be reported verbally to the meeting</p>		
Item No.		Originator:
2	Minutes	Member of the public
<p><u>Comments received in email from member of the public on 8th September 2025</u> I refer to point 29 of the above referenced Minutes - Land West Lyth Hill Road, Bayston Hill, Shrewsbury, Shropshire (24/00765/FUL). I note that item 2 on the agenda for the Northern Planning Committee Meeting, on 16/09/2025, is to confirm those Minutes. However, they are inaccurate. The Minutes should refer to the fact that Councillor Rowley made a proposal to reject the application which Councillor Ebbs seconded. It should also be recorded that, in a procedural irregularity, that proposal was not voted on, despite that proposal still being extant. In addition, the Minutes should refer to the procedural irregularity that Councillor Rowley never made an unqualified proposal to defer, rather he stated his conditions to make such a proposal but with those conditions never being met. Councillor Ebbs then purported to second a proposal, to defer, that had not actually been made. The Minutes should also record that a vote, to defer, then proceeded with Councillor Davis still asking questions about what he was voting for/actually agreeing to. The Minutes also refer to the Development Services Manager advising that deferring the application may result in the developer submitting an appeal for non-determination of the application. In fact, Charlotte Morison told the meeting, just at the point that they had a seconded proposal to reject the application, that the Council had a notice of intention to appeal from the developer. There is a difference between may appeal and having given notice of an intention. The Minutes need to accurately record what the Committee was told by Ms Morrison. The Minutes also record that Ms Morrison, confirmed and supported by the Council's Solicitor, advised that the application would come back to the Northern Planning Committee for determination. What the Minutes do not record is that Ms Morrison added a proviso that this would be the case if the developer did not appeal but that an appeal would put the application in the hands of the Secretary of State, not in the hands of Shropshire Council. It is important that the Minutes reflect this, because, before the Chair moved to a vote on deferment, Councillor Rowley asked if a deferment could be made with a requirement that the application came back to Committee. Ms Morrison was not able to confirm that would be the case. Please confirm that the Minutes will be amended as it is crucial for the transparency and accountability of the decision making process, by elected representatives, that this official record is accurate. It is also essential for legal compliance.</p> <p><u>Officer Response</u> The minutes of the meeting of the Northern Planning Committee summarise the discussion leading up to the decision taken, they are not a verbatim record. The minutes do not note every proposition, just the substantive outcome of a proposition that has been voted on by the committee. This approach is consistent with all Shropshire Council planning committee minutes. Councillor Rowley stated that he was happy to change his proposal to refuse the application and moved to defer, having received the advice of the Development Services Manager and the Council's Solicitor. This amended proposal to defer the application was seconded by Councillor Ebb. It was this substantive proposition that was voted on and carried and this is what is recorded in the minutes.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	25/01810/REM Hencote	SC Ecology
<p><i>It looks as though only 4 swift bricks, 5 bat boxes and 5 bird boxes (open-fronted and standard design) are being proposed. The site can support a much greater number of boxes. Boxes for sparrows, starlings and wrens should also be included.</i></p>		

Swift bricks should be positioned: 1) Out of direct sunlight; 2) At the highest possible position in the building's wall; 3) In clusters of at least three; 4) 50 to 100cm apart; 5) Not directly above windows; 6) With a clear flightpath to the entrance; and 7) North or east/west aspects preferred.

Ideally, the placement of boxes should be designed at the same time as the lighting scheme (under condition 18), otherwise the locations will need to be amended at discharge stage.

Gravel boards and amphibian-friendly gully pots should be included in the landscaping plan.

CASE OFFICER COMMENTS:

In order to address the above comments it is recommended that, if Members are minded to grant reserved matter approval, that this is subject to an additional condition to require that details of additional bat and bird boxes and swift bricks are submitted for approval; along with the incorporation of wildlife and amphibian-friendly gravel boards and gully pots.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	25/01810/REM Hencote	Applicant

An additional statement has been submitted by the applicant which summarises the wider benefits that the scheme provides:

- 1. A modern social care facility, much needed in the local area (confirmed by Shropshire Council and Appeal decision paragraph 55).*
- 2. Inward investment of around £75 million to the area (Appeal decision paragraph 59).*
- 3. Potential savings and operational advantages to the National Health Service, of around £1000 per annum per resident and freeing up hospital beds (Appeal decision paragraph 60 and 61).*
- 4. Release of around 200 homes (many of these larger family homes) in the local area (Appeal decision paragraph 56).*
- 5. A £1.3 million contribution towards affordable housing secured via the Unilateral Undertaking at the Outline stage.*
- 6. Highway benefits including crossing on Ellesmere Road and enhanced footpath to Hencote Lane.*
- 7. Biodiversity benefits included (secured prior to mandatory benefits being required).*
- 8. Approximately 450 workers employed during the construction process.*
- 9. Approximately 155 full time equivalent jobs throughout the site once operational.*

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	25/01810/REM Hencote	Local Member – Cllr B Jephcott

Objects.

This reserved matters application follows on directly from the outline scheme which 176 local residents including me objected to in 2021, which Shropshire Council initially rejected, only to change their view just before a planning inquiry. Residents remain dismayed at the plan which will destroy Winney Hill, impose a massive extra traffic load onto Ellesmere Road and obscure the finest view of Shrewsbury from public gaze. It is a

tragedy that this beautiful hillside, an amenity to the Heath Farm and Greenfields community for generations, has not been protected as public open space.

I recognise however that given the decision of the inquiry inspector in 2023, the outline is approved and it is likely that permission at this stage is also likely to be given as the council cannot afford to be on the wrong side of another legal judgement - but I hope councillors will be as pro-active as possible in setting conditions to minimise the damage.

I continue to object to the scheme and to the nature of the design provided, both as a town councillor which has objected to this application, as a local resident, and as the local Shropshire councillor. I also agree with the view of the Civic Society.

The elevations of the largest building, the three storey nursing home on the slopes of Winney Hill, show an enormous gable end glass window looking south towards Ellesmere Road and vast sheets of dark metal cladding. The yellow brick originally proposed in the design has no relationship to traditional Shropshire materials.

If members are minded to approve, I request that conditions are imposed for a more sympathetic palette of materials - the design statement seems to include options for red brick - this should be of a decent quality specification - and surely the building could have less zinc cladding, in particular on the upper wall parallel with Ellesmere Road.

There needs to be absolute clarity on who is responsible for maintaining the road network. A footpath around the site, permissive or otherwise, would allow residents to see the view of Shrewsbury which otherwise will be lost. The materials and design statement should accord as closely as possible with traditional local practice. I also remain unconvinced that so much concrete and tarmac on a hillside is not going to lead to a further rise in groundwater levels and flood risk to the low lying areas near Ellesmere Road to the south - which are already facing two approved developments at Cedars Drive and the Mara Homes plan for the field west of Ellesmere Road. The recent heavy rain has already seen the groundwater level in the drainage pond south of Rowan Close rise rapidly.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	25/01810/REM Hencote	Public representation
- Totally out of keeping with the site and will create enormous infrastructure problems in particular increased traffic on the Ellesmere Road, pressure on existing GP surgeries and shopping facilities. It will also insert an unnecessary visual block to an important historic view of Shrewsbury from the north.		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
Item No.	Application No.	Originator: